SEARCHING FOR RELEVANCE IN HISTORY

Ebere Nwauban
Imo State University

In the 1950's, graduates in the Humanities but especially in History, were held in high regard by policy-makers and employers in Nigeria[1]. But today, three decades later, there is no running away from the fact that History is beleaguered. In 1983, a Nigerian Federal Minister asserted that,

> The country now needs technological and result oriented education so as to prepare for the future. America and Russia did not go to the moon by studying history, philosophy, English Language etc. but did so by encouraging technological growth.[2]

Scientism - absolute faith in the capacity of science to solve all conceivable human problems - has enveloped our society and age. This is quite understandable, especially for a "developing" country like Nigeria, where there is a crying need to improve health, grow more food, and to expand local manufactures in all spheres. And it is science and technology that satisfy these needs. Man's future would therefore seem to lie with a relentless pursuit of the science enterprise. The Humanities (or the Liberal Arts) can neither make a pin nor build a hut. They are thus being challenged to earn their keep by demonstrating their relevance to the needs of a people very desperate for salvation from a deepening sociological destitution. Specifically, non-historians are asking what History is good for in the sense of what utility it has, the practical purpose it serves.

On the Concept of Relevance

First, it must be pointed out that *all* human knowing inevitably has some social context. Sociologists of knowledge have continued to stress the correlation between the knowledge propounded by a scholar and the social situation confronting him.[3] In a sense, History in particular is akin to Art.[4] Art in any form – whether written or not – in poems, music, story-telling, in portrait-making or in the crafts is basically an alternative in the imagination to the reality around us. Art is therefore a meditation about life, and so is History.

While History deals with the past of man, not all that past is history. The historian in his search after expression has to select his details, selecting those that suggest the deeper and more enduring meaning of what is actual in the most intelligible sense. Besides, History does not deal with the ephemeral or the transient; it is concerned with things of enduring permanence, things that affect the course of human evolution. So History has to do with the past only in so far as it is not totally past. In philosophical

terms, one may say that historical being has two ontological elements: actuality and permanence and history is defined by its permanence, that is, its meaning or relevance for the present.

Relevance to social reality is, therefore, at the heart of the historian's endeavour. For in the final analysis, the past has no meaningful existence except as it lives or exists for those for whom it is reconstructed. "The field of reality which the historian takes as his province" is according to Maurice Mandelbaum, "limited to the field of human events which possess significance for societal life"[5]. In spite of Ranke's insistence on a value-free History, it is today readily acknowledged that the historian is not a "disembodied spirit", a perfect and polished mind", but rather "a creature of time, place, circumstance, interests, predilections, culture."[6] Thus every historian's work bears a relation to his own personality and the age and circumstance in which he lives.[7] It is doubtful whether there is actually anything like history for history's sake, history for nobody.

African historiography, especially since the 1950's would indeed seem to exhibit all the trade-marks of protest literature, or petition-writing. There is, of course, a sense in which every literary work is a protest against the human condition. But to the African historian, "protest" implies something much more sinister than the mere human act of confronting normal existential problems. The painful memory of slavery, the humiliation of colonisation, the invidious power of neo-colonialism in its multi-faceted ramifications, the reality of poverty, alienation, oppression and exploitation, of chaos and instability, the whole sense of impotence, of total impotence, these are the historical realities that underpin the African collective experience and they inform the creative imagination of the historian of Africa.

History, the Midwife of Science

The modern epoch in European history, with its science and technology, opened with the Renaissance. And the Renaissance was simply a heightened interest in the past: it was distinctly a revival of the learning of the classical times.[8]

By breaking through the ecclesiastical fixation of medieval thought and bringing to the front again an interest in secular matters, the Renaissance ushered in a new age. Europeans developed a new spirit of inquiry, freedom of thought and action. This spirit was consolidated by the Reformation - another humanist effort - which undermined the domination of the church over society and culture. The Renaissance and the Reformation led to the age of Enlightenment that enabled men like Isaac Newton (1642-1727) to propose that the force of gravity rather than God made things to fall. This view could not have been openly canvassed

before the Renaissance.

History in a very real sense thus served as the midwife to modern science and technology. It was the study of their past that awakened Europeans to the great ideas and civilisation their Greek and Roman ancestors had created before the coming of semitic christianity. With this re-discovery the Europeans developed a new spirit of intellectual self-confidence and belief in their own creativity; this spirit ultimately laid the groundwork for modern science and technology.

History and the African search for Technology

A feature one finds very painful in the African neo-colonial reality is the mentality of helplessness, a mentality which does not see the possibility of Africa ever standing on its own. African history has the capacity to purge the African of this mental capitulation and its accompanying dependency and inadequacy complexes. African history can thus also build our confidence in our own creativity as we search for "modern" technology.

There was enough science in our society based on experimentation and observation before the white man came. The knowledge of plant and animal taxonomy gave our forebears skill in medicine. Mining, textile-works, dye-making, leather-making and crafts generally, iron-works, bronze-casting, to name a few, were made possible in the pre-contact cultures by science and technology.

But today, our ruling elite and even most intellectuals conceive of science and technology as existing on their own, and that all we need do is stretch our hands forth and pluck them. They believe that our past has nothing to contribute to the present, that the transplantation of western industrial structures - physical and institutional - is the ordained road to "modernity". So the totality of our heritage is scorned: our indigenous technology is crude and "primitive", our indigenous medicine is profane, our locally-brewed gin is "illicit" gin and until the late 1960's, its producers like the Awka arms manufacturers were raided by the police and even jailed.

Meanwhile, history teaches that the stage attained by any society in any sphere at all at any given time is the end-product of its entire evolution through time. Technology, any technology, is culture-specific because any technology is after all the out-growth of a given culture, a response to the particular social needs of a people at a given point in time. This proposition is true, even in the history of Western science and technology.[9] Nearer home, the Biafrans pressed by the pangs of a total blockade which cut them off from the outside world during the Nigerian Civil War, produced - largely from local materials - perhaps "crude", but effectively functional tanks, rockets, mortars, anti-aircraft guns, land mines, the *Ogbunigwe*, agricultural implements, communications and telephone

systems, built the Uli Airport which was second only to Johannesburg as the busiest international airport in Africa, and they also created a petroleum refining capacity that gave Biafra the most widely diffused petroleum technology in Africa.[10]

Industrial inventions are, therefore, social products in the sense that the questions that are posed to the inventor's mind as well as the materials for his projects are shaped by the social and economic needs of this time.

Western models can only provide a point of reference as we aspire to acquire "modern" technology. But nobody will transfer his technology to us, partly because everyone jealously guards his technology which is after all his own distinct cultural heritage, but also because it is just impossible to transfer cultures. True, Japan sent out her youths to learn and copy from the West, but back in Japan, such skills were grafted to a Japanese background.[11]

Let us promote the study of western science and technology. We may also make concerted attempts to copy, steal, borrow or buy other people's technology. But, the outcome of these efforts must be built upon our own identities and institutions, otherwise the result will be the creation of expensive monuments to Western technology, monuments that cannot be internalised into our life-style. Our culture is therefore the most enduring anvil we have for making meaningful change in our societies.

It needs be emphasised that to master foreign technology, a knowledge of the relevant culture that gave birth to that technology is necessary; that the key to any culture is its language; these processes involve the sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. Even if we become a computerised society today, we shall still need the languages, the medium in which *all* intellectual and social discourse must be conducted. No knowledge is irrelevant; all branches of knowledge are threads of one great tapestry. Thus, technology and science on the one hand and the humanities on the other are not mutually exclusive. To develop a whole man, to evolve a humane society, both must complement each other.

History - the foundation Pillar in Nation-building

It is in any case very simplistic to narrow down our definition of social "development" in "nation-building" to Western technological parameters and the economic indices at the stock exchange. In its most pervasive form, nation-building operates within the confines of a state to create a new behavioural system, mobilising the population into interdependent positions in empathy (or communal identification) with a central government.[12]

"History", Frederick Teggart writes, "provides a body of ideas which serves to unify the attitudes of the citizens of a nation towards their country... In every land the historian has been the heart at which the soul of the country has been kept alive... Not only has history writing awakened peoples to a consciousness of nationality, it has prompted them to action by inciting hopes for the future."[13]

Thus, in the process of the citizens of African countries becoming aware of themselves as the citizens of real nations, in the process of seeking to build those geo-political entities which science and technology will service, history can be just as crucial if not more crucial than science and technology.

In all ages and climes, history has served as the spring-board to organise the present. At one level, this implies that history is the medium for preserving a society's heritage and transmitting it from one generation to another. But perhaps less obvious is that most great and far-reaching movements in the world have begun with a romantic appeal to the past. History is replete with examples of communities and nations who in their hour of need looked back to their ancestors, their past, for guidance and inspiration. Apart from the Renaissance which derived its inspiration from the study of antiquity, the decisive revolutions of the Western World - the Puritan, the French, the American, as well as the European nationalist movements of the nineteenth century - all opened with somewhat romantic appeals to the past. Bismarck himself stressed that to regenerate and unify the separate and particularistic states of Germany,[14]

In Africa too, the movement for political independence derived its inspiration from the pride that flowed from African history. Thus, there was an immense literary effort to express the glory and dignity of Africa: J.C. de Graft Johnson, *African Glory*; Nnamdi Azikiwe, *Renascent Africa*; Mbonu Ojike, *My Africa*; Jomo Kenyatta, *Facing Mount Kenya*; Fily-Dabo Sissoko, *Les Noirs et la culture*; Leopold Senghor, *Anthologie de la Nouvelle Poesie Negre et Malgache*, and the French African journal, *Presence Africaine*. And when Nkrumah re-named the Gold Coast "Ghana", he wanted his new nation-state to aspire after a symbol of the best in the West African past.

"The function of history", Cheikh Anta Diop said somewhere, "is to protect a people from aggression."[15] Deny a people their history and you deny them the platform to live the present and plan the future. A lost past is therefore an endangered future. Those who have given up trying to make a sense of their past must have also given up hope for the present and the future.

The Rehabilitation of the African Identity in History

The second half of the twentieth century is reckoned to be an age

in which Africans are recovering their cultural autonomy after the depredations of western imperialism and racism. This movement expresses itself in ideas of Pan-Africanism and the African Personality, in the Organisation of African Unity, in the fight against the remnants of European imperialism in Africa and in the general reassertion of African culture. History was in the vanguard in making this movement possible in the first place. As already stated, history supplied the currents that stimulated the nationalist endeavour in Africa. African academic historians played a noble role.

The Hegelian view of an isolatable, "traditional" Africa, a static entity without history[16] gained European-wide currency in the colonial period.[17] Thus historians working on African history, all of them Europeans, and even non-historians, were too ready to agree that Africa's history began with the coming of Europeans.[18] In 1955, Cornelius W. de Kiewiet put this stream of thought succinctly enough:

"Africa south of the Sahara has no early golden age of achievement which it can invoke as justification for resisting an aggressive outer world, no proud classical tradition which it can use as a native framework on which to build a modern existence."[19]

Views such as this provided a viable intellectual platform to justify the European occupation of Africa, for a people categorised as one without history or culture, were clearly in need of European tutelage so that "civilisation" could be planted among them. Colonialism was thus associated with a *mission civilisatrice* of one form or another. The British, for example, believed that their presence in Africa was a prerequisite for the promotion of "progress in civilisation and justice."[20]

The decolonisation process in Africa was nearing fruition after World War II. Independence for most Africans States was near. Africans were going on the initiative again in history. It was a process that called for the re-assertion of the African as a culturally distinct and vibrant species. There was the need to restore the psychical balance of the African by re-instating the historicity of his society. That was why the old kingdoms of Ghana, Mali, Songhai, Kanem-Borno, Oyo, Benin, Dahomey, etc were resurrected and displayed as African achievements in empire-building. With equal stress, Mombassa, Kilwa, Lamu and Malindi were held to be Swahili, and therefore African rather than Arab cities. The relics of Meroe, Axum, Zimbabwe and Timbuktu were projected as examples of African creativity. African anti-European resistance leaders like Kosoko of Lagos, Jaja of Opobo, Samori Toure, Rabih Zubair, the Mahdists of Sudan, Msiri of Nyamwezi and Menelik of Ethiopia were transformed into heroes in the drama of African liberation. History distinguished itself in restoring to the African confidence in his capacity for political action, in his ability to effect

the course of history. Thus, against African inactivity in the making of history has been asserted the African agency. This was the ideological background to Africanist historiography.

Since the 1950's, African History has been pre-occupied with restoring dignity to the black man by reconstructing the African World which Eurocentric racism devalued and tried to extirpate. There may not have been any comprehensive abandonment of old anti-African prejudices, but Western scholarship and propaganda have had to make tactical retreats from specific orthodoxies as the increasing weight of countervailing evidence makes them ridiculously untenable. Today, it seems natural enough for us to readily proclaim "Black is beautiful", or "I am black and proud". But we do not seem to appreciate how much intellectual effort went into preparing the ground for this chest-beating.

History and the Issues in African's Underdevelopment

But History has been concerned not only with the liberation of Africa from European colonial domination but also from neo-colonialism. Africa is very dependent on the West, economically, scientifically, technologically and even culturally. The continent has thus become not only stagnant, it is indeed sliding into decay. Many - historians and social scientists - have turned to history for an explanation of this state of affairs.

Robin Palmer and Neil Parsons, editors of *The Roots of Rural Poverty in Central and Southern Africa* (1971), looked back to rediscover the roots of the impoverishment of the African. Others have followed Samir Amin[21] to examine the stages of the capitalist impact upon African political economies, showing how the colonial impress dislocated the buoyancy of the pre-contact system.[22]

It is in the dependency and development of under-development theses that history's concern and explanation for Africa's paralysis have found an eloquent manifestation.[23] The theses argue that the external exchange relations which were inaugurated via the penetration of European capitalism distorted indigenous economy by fostering sectors which catered solely for foreign demand, and that as a result of the creation of asymmetrical exchange relationships, surplus value was transferred from the colonies (the periphery) to Europe (the centre). The process of excavation has continued even after the colonies achieved "flag" independence, as a consequence of the monopoly power of large multi-national corporations acting in concert with tame national bourgeois governments.

Thus Western capitalism, far from transforming African societies to the images of metropolitan capitalist societies - a phenomenon prophesised by Marx and Lenin[24] - has in fact dislocated them thereby promoting

underdevelopment, i.e. keeping these societies in a state of stagnation and in the process blocking their transformation.

A recent application of this theory is Gunilla Andrae and Bjorn Beckman, *The Wheat Trap: Bread and Underdevelopment in Nigeria* (1985). This study shows how bread gradually came to fill the demand of a ready and cheap food by the increased non-agricultural urban population created in Nigeria by the oil-boom of the 1970's. In his April 1984 Budget, General Buhari (then Nigeria's Head of State) could say that he would allow unrestricted wheat imports because "bread has become the cheapest staple food of our people". Given this fictitious assumption that bread was so important, Nigerian governments got easily persuaded by agencies like the United States Agency for International Development, the Food and Agricultural Organisation and the World Bank into irrigation projects under which wheat would be grown in the northern dry season, the season closest to the temperate requirements of wheat crop. "Self-sufficiency" was conjured up to provide "good ideological cover for a process which pulls Nigerian agriculture into capitalist agrarian transformation on a world scale".

Today, none of the irrigation projects under the Lake Chad Basin, the Kano River, and the Bakalori Dam projects have justified any of the grounds on which they were set up, namely, that the investments are profitable, that they will reduce Nigeria's dependence on imported food, that they will save foreign exchange, that they will generate rural income and rural development. Where imported technologies have not ruined the soil, they have deprived the peasant farmers of valuable land for the growing of local staples by withholding water from downstream. And between 1975 and 1985, Nigeria spent an average of N1 billion on wheat-related agriculture. Meanwhile, the consumption of imported wheat-derived foods (over 90 percent from U.S.A.) continued to grow tremendously. These processes not only under-developed Nigeria's agriculture through their accompanying dislocations, but have also worsened the country's food dependence.

The study provides a splendid example of the effect of the penetration of international capital on "Third world" agriculture.

It will be observed that in yielding explanations to the African situation, most of these works employ the concepts and categories of political economy, and could therefore be said to be strictly not works of history by historians. It is enough to state that political economy is simply "the science of the social relations of production" in time perspective.[25] And it is only History that studies social evolution in time perspective.

Relevance in the Historical Method

The essence of Western education - to understand the totality of reality - is paradoxically little taken into account in discussing the relevance of the various disciplines. The world of reality is manifold, endless in extent and infinite in variety. To enable a finite human mind comprehend this reality, some "division of labour" becomes necessary. The various disciplines - whether of the humanities, the natural or the social sciences - are in actuality various branches of the one and the same tree of knowledge. They represent various approaches in the search for Truth, defined as the totality of reality or nature.

The scientist's search for a unified explanation of natural phenomena hinges on two main hypotheses. The first is that all the diverse phenomena of nature derive in a harmonious way from some ultimate, unified source. The second is that nature can be fully explained in terms of numbers and mathematical assumption of modern western science.

The question, especially for those who chorus Henry Ford's "History is bunk" is that: Is there never more than one way, one method of knowledge! In other words, can the science method alone enable us to comprehend the totality of reality?

In the sciences, the standard medium for measuring and comparing phenomena is mathematics. Given a numerical standard, all quantities of the same kind or related to the same standard can be mathematically compared. But the mathematical method finds its largest and surest application where the differences of quality are fewest; it becomes less and less fruitful as these differences increase in number. For example, the simple notions of the heavenly bodies are uniformly subject to exact mathematical calculation and predetermination, while the precise movements of an animal are less, and the complex conduct of man least of all. Thus, as we rise in the scale of qualitative development from the chemical compound to the plant, from the plant to the animal, and from the animal governed by instinct to man governed by reason, we find mathematics less and less adequate as an agency of investigation and explanation.

The science method works on the basis of clearly stated assumptions which greatly simplify the complexities of real life; in other words, the scientific theory is as Jacob Viner, an economist, has put it, "always simpler than reality. Even when it seems terribly complex, it is still '*simpliste*' as compared to the range of factors operating as conditions, as means or as ends, in any actual concrete situation."[26]

Historians do not agree on the appropriate categories for classifying the phenomenon of history. This disagreement reflects the difficulty of observing and the frequent impossibility of quantifying the variables that historians do manage to identify. They do not enjoy the

advantages of the economist who measures a society's change over time, in terms of gross national product, its wealth in terms of per capita income, and the substance of all economic interaction in terms of some unit of monetary exchange. Historians seldom have the advantages of the psychologist who can test his hypothesis in a controlled laboratory setting with a relatively small number of subjects. Historians deal with large numbers of people in an uncontrolled setting where each individual has many behavioural patterns open to him.

Consequently, attempts to express the human past solely in terms of the much simpler changes in the natural sciences (for instance, in terms of biological evolution, statistical growth-curves or invariant psychological mechanisms) over simplify and falsify it. The social life of man, the evolution of society, the relations between states - all these transformations differ from those in atoms, electric currents or in plants and animals. Changes in human affairs belong to the sphere of qualitative change, defy complete mathematical calculation and demand a new instrument of comparison and comprehension.

History deals with transformations of a qualitative character while the sciences deal with quantitative change. The latter seek to discover the uniformities that exist in space. History seeks to ascertain what particular changes have taken place in a definite time and place with the aim of appreciating their value of significance as manifestations of the qualitative aspect of the universe.

Like the historian, the social scientist is also concerned with the study of man. The aim is to unearth knowledge that is neither socially nor historically relative. Thus, a principle in Sociology is supposedly true for the ancient Greek, for the 18th century Mexican and the 20th century American. The concern of the social scientist is therefore with states of affairs, with societies as they are, not on processes of change.

Conversely, History has a more dynamic appreciation of human nature. Unlike the static bias of the social sciences, History studies human societies with the emphasis on the differences between them and on the changes which have taken place in each one over time. In short, History studies how societies have come about. Whatever its imperfections, it is History ALONE that can inform us about the behaviour, even suggest the motives of man through time, and in space as well.

Man has a historical dimension just as he has a social and aesthetic dimension. Man apprehends and experiences life in a way that has been determined by his History. History remains closest to life experiences; it is the spontaneous natural expression born afresh with every child as it searches the mystery of its existence. The human society needs to know certain things as of right, things which cannot be discovered

by the science method. It needs at least to know HOW and even why it has arrived at its present destination, and only history can provide the answer.

General Comments

To those who still insist, "what is the use of history?" the most elementary reply is that they try to imagine what every-day life would be like in a society in which no one knew what happened yesterday. To close our eyes to history is to make the mistake a psychiatrist would make if he were to pay attention only to the stress-situation in which his patient finds himself at the present moment. It cannot be denied that to operate in the present, one needs to understand the past.

Apart from enabling us know where we are coming from and how we have journeyed, History enlarges our sympathies to the extent that we can identify with those of other ages and climes. There is no wishing history away. We are all - historians and non-historians alike - constantly calling upon history when in various forms we seek relief in the common places cliche, "History will judge", or declare current economic hardship "unprecedented", or perceive a decline in the moral health of our society.

Man has an indomitable propensity for regarding as legitimate whatever is rooted in history. In order to make a present state of affairs appear beyond question, it is usually necessary to prove the antiquity of this state. "Rights" and "laws" are therefore proven most effectively by appeal to history. In African, each social unit - family, lineage, village, clan, and often even the ethnic group - typically has an established tradition about its origins, why and how it differs from its neighbours, the basis of the title of the community land etc. The acquisition of this corpus of historical knowledge is still today an essential part of growing up and no person who is ignorant of the history of his unit is considered an adult. Any real adult just has to know these traditions far from them, basic information for resolving issues on land, housing, succession to offices and a whole gamut of social and political relations are derived.

Like academic history, these traditions are in fact a device for structuring how in the community's experience things came to be what they are. Perhaps, even more importantly, these traditions point easily to the most vital function of history, as the medium for preserving, sustaining, transmitting and projecting the heritage, the identity, the essence of a given social group. Given this matrix, the African has a very high sense and regard for history at the micro-level.

Regrettably, in our public life, at the macro levels of social organisation, we disdain history. And since we lack a consciousness of history, we behave as if there was no yesterday and exude little if any confidence in tomorrow, and that is why we are only concerned with a

vegetative existence, with the life of now. And since we are so oblivious of the verdict of history, we care little for the type of legacy we are building for our children.

Essentially, what historians are engaged in doing is interpreting the raw data which pertain to history as past human experience in order to make statements which we also call "History" about this experience. Thus the basic criterion by which we must judge History as an academic discipline is whether those engaged in it are advancing our knowledge or understanding of what happened in the past. But History is not an exact science, and so the historian is not a chronicler of the past. The historian does not aim at establishing a photographically exact reconstruction of the past. History like Art disentangles the significance of the whole from its details and reproduces it.

History may not provide the key to unlock the mysteries of civilisation, but neither can any other discipline all on its own. That must remain a collective enterprise, and undoubtedly an ever-going process: this latter proposition is the *raison d'etre* for the continuing pursuit of knowledge in all fields, including History.

Notes

1. See T.N. Tamuno, *History and History-Makers in Modern Nigeria*, An Inaugural Lecture delivered at the University of Ibadan on 25 October 1973 (Ibadan University Press, 1973), p.14.

2. The minister was Alhaji Bilyaminu Usman, the Federal Minister for Student Affairs in the defunct Shagari Administration. See *Nigerian Statesman* (Owerri, Nov. 29 1983).

3. See K. Mannheim, "The Sociology of Knowledge" in J.E. Curtis and J.W. Petras eds.) *The Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1935), esp. p. 115; W.T. Fontaine, "Social Determination in the Writings of Negro Scholars," *The American Journal of Sociology*, XLIX, 1 (July 1943), p. 302; W.T. Deininger, *Problems in Social and Political Thought* (London: Collier Macmillan, 1970), pp. 361-363; R. Fernandez, *The Promise of Sociology* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975), p. 15 for Karl Marx, one's ideas are conditioned by the material conditions of life, as determined by one's class or socio-economic position. See K. Marx, "Preface" in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859), trans. by N.I. Stone (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1904), pp. 11-12.

4. History is not merely imagination, it must always rest on a severely

proved premise. History is a science to the extent to which what are commonly known as scientific methods are requisite for accuracy and proper proportion in the details used in the presentation.

5. M. Mandelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge* (New York, 1938), p.8.

6. Charles A. Beard, "That Noble Dream," *American Historical Review* XLI (1935), pp. 83-84.

7. C.A. Beard, Review of M. Mandelbaum, *The Problem of Historical Knowledge* (1938) in *American Historical Review*, XLIV (1939), pp. 171-172; Carl A. Becker, *Everyman His Own Historian* (New York, 1935), p. 253; Viscount Haldane, *The Meaning of Truth in History* (Creighton Lecture delivered at the University of London on 6 March 1914).

8. See V.H.H. Green, *Renaissance and Reformation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1945); H.A.L. Fisher, *A History of Europe* (London: Edward Arnold, 1957).

9. Maurice Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism* (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 268-269.

10. See P.N.C. Okigbo, *Towards a Reconstruction of the Political Economy of Igbo Civilisation*, 1986 Ahiajoku Lecture (Owerri, 1986). 11. R.N. Ogbudinkpa, *The Economics of the Nigerian Civil War, Its Prospects for National Development* (Enugu, FDP, 1985).

11. See W.G. Beasley, *The Modern History of Japan* (1965); R. Storry, *A History of Modern Japan* (Penguin Books, 1968); G.C. Allen, *Japan's Economic Policy* (The Macmillan Press Ltd. 1980).

12. This is an adaptation from E.W. Soja, *The Geography of Modernisation in Kenya, A Spatial Analysis of Social, Economic and Political Change* (Syracuse University Press, 1968). See also R.S. Jordan and J.P. Renninger, "The New Environment of Nation-Building", *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 13, 2 (June 1975), p. 189.

13. F.J. Teggart, *Theory and Processes of History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941), pp. 28-29.

14. H.M. Stephens, "Nationality and History" *American Historical Review*,

XXI, 2 (Jan. 1961); Also, H.E. Barnes, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), chapter IX.

15. See *Daily Times* (Lagos, Nov. 17, 1979).

16. See G.W.P. Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History* trans. by H.B. Nisbet, (Cambridge, 1970), esp. p. 190.

17. See E.H. Dance, *History the Betrayer: A Study of Bias* (London, 1960).

18. Before the coming of Europeans in the middle of the 19th century, the "main body of Africans", wrote Reginald Coupland for example "had stayed, for untold centuries in barbarism ... stagnant, neither going forward nor going back." See R. Coupland, *Kirk on the Zambezi* (Oxford, 1928), p.3; also C.G. Seligman, *Races of Africa* (1930), p. 6; J.D. Fage, *An Introduction to the History of West Africa* (1964), pp. 18, 27 M. Perham, "The British Problem in Africa", *Foreign Affairs*, 29, 4 (July 1951).

19. C.W. de Kiewiet, "African Dilemmas," *Foreign Affairs*, 32, 2 (Jan. 1955), pp. 447-448.

20. See F.D. Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa* (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1922), p. 95.

21. Samir Amin, "Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa Origins and Contemporary Forms", *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 19 (1972), pp. 503-524; Idem, *Neo-Colonialism in West Africa* (Penguin Africana Library, 1973); Idem, *Accumulation on a World Scale* (New York, 1974).

22. See for example, J.H. Latham, *Old Calabar 1600-1891: The Impact of the International Economy upon a Traditional Society* (1973); W.I. Ofonagoro, *Trade and Imperialism in Southern Nigeria 1881-1929* (1979), Sharon Stichter, *Migrant Labour in Kenya: Capitalism and African Response* (1980); Bill Freund, *Capital and Labour in the Nigerian Tin Mines* (1981); Michael Watts, *Silent Violence: Food, Famine and Peasantry* (1983); Robert Shenton, *The Development of Capitalism in Northern Nigeria* (1985).

23. Inspired by Marxist-Leninist theories of imperialism, the theses originated in Latin America in the 1960's when disappointment with the failure of Western-inspired "development" plans led to increasingly radical

criticism of "conventional" policy recommendations. Such criticisms were reflected in Andre Gunder Frank, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution* (New York and London, 1969); Idem, *Lumpenbourgeoisie: Lumpen development: Dependence, Class and Politics in Latin America* (New York and London, 1972). Frank rejected the diffusionist model of international capital/trade as an agency of economic growth, arguing instead that capitalism has retarded the independent development of Latin America. In Africa, the classic remains Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (first published, London and Dar es Salaam: Bogle - L'Ouverture and Tanzania Publishing House, 1972). Others works have followed: see those of Samir Amin cited in Note 21 (above); E.A. Brett, *Colonialism and Underdevelopment in East Africa* (New York: Nok, 1973); Colin Leys, *Underdevelopment in Kenya: The Political Economy of Neo-Colonialism* (London: Heineman, 1975); and Bode Onimode, *Imperialism and Underdevelopment in Nigeria* (Macmillan, 1983).

24. See K. Marx, "The British Rule in India" (1853) in K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Colonialism* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976), p. 35-41; V.I. Lenin, *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism* 1st. published 1916 (1933), p. 59.

25. Andre Barjouet, *Que 'est-ce que l'Economic Politique* (Paris, 1962), p.15.

26. J. Viner, *International Trade and Economic Development* (1952), p. 12.